REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action dated April 2, 2009. All rejections and objections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The amendments to the claims herein are clarifications intended to more precisely set forth the present invention. System and computer program product claims have also been re-introduced.

Support for the present claim amendments is found at various places in the Specification as originally filed and illustrated in the Drawings. For example, support for the present claim amendments is found from line 15 on page 4 to line 8 on page 5, and from line 12 on page 11 through line 3 on page 14 of the Specification as originally filed.

No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Amendments to the claims herein are respectfully believed to meet all requirements in this regard.

Claims 1-2 and 7-9 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, based on the combination of U.S. patent application 2004/0172456 ("Green et al.") and U.S. patent number 6,507,845 of Cohen et al. ("Cohen et al."). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Green et al. disclose a graphical user interface that includes a list of other users of the computer service selected by the user as significant to the user, a list of computer resources stored on the host system by the user, and a list of links to data content that have been selected by the user. In paragraph 13, Green et al. disclose that a list of other users who have been informed about a link within the list of links can be displayed, and the display can occur in a supplemental

interface related to the link. Green et al. further disclose that a list of links about which another user has been informed can be displayed in a supplemental interface related to the other user.

Green et al. disclose a UI 600 in Fig. 6 that operates such that when the application running the UI 600 receives a notification that an email message has been received from a "buddy", a mail icon 606 is displayed in the window 601 next to the buddy's screen name 604 to indicate that email has been received from the buddy. Green et al. further teaches that when the user scrolls over the mail icon 606 with a mouse, information about email received from the buddy, such as the number of unread emails received from the buddy, and the date and time the email was send and the subject of the email, is displayed to the user.

Cohen et al. disclose techniques for supporting improved awareness of and collaboration among users involved in a task. Cohen et al. provide techniques in which activity data is displayed simultaneously in two separate regions of a screen display. A first region in the Cohen et al. display contains a list of users in association with an activity most recently performed by each user. A second region in the Cohen et al. display can contain a list of data objects in association with an activity most recently performed on each of the data objects. Cohen et al. further teach that collaboration tools can be accessible through the list of users or the list of data objects.

Nowhere in the combination of Green et al. and Cohen et al. is there disclosed or suggested a method of providing remote user activity information regarding recently accessed documents of remote users to a local user, comprising:

> ***monitoring, by a remote awareness client application process executing on a remote computer system, a plurality of open display windows on said remote computer system, wherein said monitoring includes recording document access information regarding a remote computer system user, wherein said document access activity***

includes names of a plurality of documents accessed through said open display windows and names of a plurality of application programs associated with said open display windows;

communicating said document access information together with an identifier of said remote computer system user to an awareness server application process executing on a server system;

. . .

registering, with said awareness server application process by said local awareness client application process, responsive to said local awareness client application process displaying said awareness display object associated with said remote computer system user, for said local awareness client application process to receive information associated with said remote computer system user;

broadcasting by said awareness server application process to said local awareness client application process, responsive to said local awareness client application having registered to receive information associated with said remote computer system user, said document access information;

displaying, by said local awareness client application process, a special icon in said user interface displayed on said local computer system;

detecting a selection of said special icon by said local computer system user; and

displaying, by said awareness client application process, in response to said detecting said selection of said special icon by said local computer system user, said document access information in said user interface displayed on said local computer system. (emphasis added)

as in the present independent claim 1. As discussed in the previous response, the combination of Green et al. and Cohen et al. would result in a system that displays a list of remote users with email icons through which information about email with each buddy can be obtained and that displays for each buddy information about a *single activity* performed either currently or most recently with regard to a *single document*. Neither Green et al. nor Cohen et al. include any hint or suggestion of even the desirability of monitoring, by a remote awareness client application process executing on a remote computer system, a plurality of open display windows on said remote computer system, wherein said monitoring includes recording document access information regarding a remote computer system user, wherein said document access activity includes names of a plurality of documents accessed through said open display windows and

names of a plurality of application programs associated with said open display windows; communicating said document access information together with an identifier of said remote computer system user to an awareness server application process executing on a server system; . . . registering, with said awareness server application process by said local awareness client application process, responsive to said local awareness client application process displaying said awareness display object associated with said remote computer system user, for said local awareness client application process to receive information associated with said remote computer system user; broadcasting by said awareness server application process to said local awareness client application process, responsive to said local awareness client application having registered to receive information associated with said remote computer system user, said document access information; displaying, by said local awareness client application process, a special icon in said user interface displayed on said local computer system; detecting a selection of said special icon by said local computer system user; and displaying, by said awareness client application process, in response to said detecting said selection of said special icon by said local computer system user, said document access information in said user interface displayed on said local computer system, as in the present independent claim 1.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Green et al. and Cohen et al. does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claim 1. Accordingly, the combination of Green et al. and Cohen et al. does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to the present independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103. As to claims 2 and 7-9, they each depend from claim 1, and are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination of Green et al. and Cohen et al. for at least the same reasons.

Claims 3-6 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, based on Green et al. and Cohen et al. in further combination with United States published patent application 2004/0039630 of Begole et al. ("Begole et al."). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As set forth above, the combination of Green et al. and Cohen et al. does not disclose or suggest all the limitations of the present independent claim 1, from which claims 3-6 depend. Combining Begole et al. with Green et al. and Cohen et al. does not remedy this difference between the teachings of Green et al. and Cohen et al. and the present independent claim 1. Begole et al. describe a system for inferring and applying coordination patterns from individual work and communication activity in which each stroke on the keyboard, movement of the mouse, and/or click on the mouse or GUI can provide information that a user of that particular keyboard, mouse, or GUI is present at the computer work station to which the input device is attached, and that activities may be recorded in a specific kind of log. Like the combination of Green et al. and Cohen et al., the combination of Green et al., Cohen et al., and Begole et al. includes no hint or suggestion of even the desirability of monitoring, by a remote awareness client application process executing on a remote computer system, a plurality of open display windows on said remote computer system, wherein said monitoring includes recording document access information regarding a remote computer system user, wherein said document access activity includes names of a plurality of documents accessed through said open display windows and names of a plurality of application programs associated with said open display windows; communicating said document access information together with an identifier of said remote computer system user to an awareness server application process executing on a server system; . . . registering, with said awareness server application process by said local awareness client application process, responsive to said local awareness client application process displaying said

awareness display object associated with said remote computer system user, for said local awareness client application process to receive information associated with said remote computer system user; broadcasting by said awareness server application process to said local awareness client application process, responsive to said local awareness client application having registered to receive information associated with said remote computer system user, said document access information; displaying, by said local awareness client application process, a special icon in said user interface displayed on said local computer system; detecting a selection of said special icon by said local computer system user; and displaying, by said awareness client application process, in response to said detecting said selection of said special icon by said local computer system user, said document access information in said user interface displayed on said local computer system, as in the present independent claim 1.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Green et al., Cohen et al. and Begole et al. does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claim 1. Accordingly, the combination of Green et al., Cohen et al. and Begole et al. does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 with regard to independent claim 1. As to claims 3-6, they each depend from claim 1, and are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination of Green et al., Cohen et al. and Begole et al. for at least the same reasons.

Reconsideration of all claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants have amended claims herein. However, Applicants are not conceding in this application that the unamended claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of allowable

subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the unamended claims in one or more continuation and/or divisional patent applications.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

October 1, 2009
Date

/David Dagg/
David A. Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
44 Chapin Road
Newton, MA 02459
(617) 630-1131

Docket No. 260-008